

## REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated June 25, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 11-20 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 11 and 13-19 have been amended; and claim 12 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

To facilitate the Examiner's reconsideration of the present application, the Applicants have provided amendments to the specification, the abstract and the figures. The changes to the specification, the abstract and the figures include minor editorial and clarifying changes. Replacement portions of the specification, a new abstract and a replacement sheet for Fig. 7 are provided. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the specification, the abstract and the figures.

In the Office Action, claims 12-16 and 19 have been objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended independent claim 11 to include the features of allowed claim 12; and claims 13-15 and 19 have been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of their base claim (i.e., claim 11). Claims 13-15 and 19 depend directly from independent claim 11, and claim 16 depends from claim 13 (now rewritten in independent form). Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 12-16 and 19 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that claim 19 recites "the green coherent light source," which does not have proper antecedent basis. The Applicants have amended claim 19 to correct the lack of proper antecedent basis noted by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 11 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Deng et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0146764, hereafter "Deng"); claims 11, 17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cannon et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0024701, hereafter "Cannon"); and claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon.

The Applicants have amended the claims to clearly distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. As noted above, the Examiner indicates that claims 12-16 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicants have rewritten claims 13-15 and 19 in independent form. Additionally, independent claim 11 has been amended to include the features of claim 12 (now canceled); and claims 17, 18 and 20 depend from independent claim 11 (now amended to include the allowable features of claim 12). Accordingly, all the claims of the present application should be in condition for allowance without any additional comments being necessary.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken'ichi KASAZUMI et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By 2009.09.25 16:43:35 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt  
Registration No. 45,794  
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ekb  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
September 25, 2009